

REMARKS

Claims 11, 12 and 20 have been amended to incorporate the features that: the fiber included in the longitudinal fiber-reinforced polymer strip is continuously extended in a length direction of the strip; the fiber included in the lateral fiber-reinforced polymer strip is continuously extended in a length direction of the strip; each of the strips is formed by surrounding the extended fiber with a polymer resin; and both of the strips are strips having experienced an extruding process but having not experienced a drawing process. The amendments are fully supported by originally filed specification and drawings (see, e.g., page 8, lines 13-17; FIGS 11a-11c; page 11, line 20 to page 13, line 4; and page 13, line 10 to page 14, line 12). No new matter has been added.

Claims 13-19 and 21-25 have been amended to make minor editorial amendments. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objection

Claim 11 was objected to for informality. The informality was obviated by the amendments.

Claim Rejections - Anticipation

Claims 11-14, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meyer et al.

Nothing in the Meyer reference discloses, teaches or suggests the features of the amended claims 11, 12 and 20.

Indeed, among others, the fill member (12) of the Meyer reference is a "drawn" film made by feeding an extruded polymer film (24) to a slit roll (26) which slits the film into a plurality of strips or members (28) and passing each of the strips or members over a fibrillator roll (30) (see col. 8, lines 5-11); in contrast, the longitudinal and lateral

strips of the present invention are ones extruded through an extruding process but not yet drawn.

Further, the fiber disclosed in the Meyer reference is a short fiber randomly arranged in a polymer (see Figures); by contrast, the fiber of the present invention is a long fiber continuously extended in a length direction of the strip.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawn of the rejections are requested.

Claim Rejections - Obviousness

Claims 13-15, 18, and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Meyer et al. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Meyer et al. in view of Hendrix et al.

As discussed above, the Meyer reference neither discloses nor teaches or suggests the features of amended claims 11, 12 and 20. Further, the Hendrix reference compensates for the deficiency of the Meyer reference.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawn of the rejections are requested.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes that the claims are in the condition for allowance.

One-month time extension is requested. If for any reason a fee is required, the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Dated: March 2, 2009

Customer No.: 21874

Respectfully submitted,

/Kongsik Kim/

Kongsik Kim (Reg. No.: 63,867)
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE, LLP

Application No.: 10/538,468
Amendment dated March 2, 2009

- 9 -

Docket No.: 69507(301067)

P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(617) 239-0100